

REMARKS

This Response is in reply to the Office Action mailed May 12, 2008. Claims 1, 3, and 5-7 were pending in the application with each of the claims being rejected. Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 1 has been amended as suggested in the Office Action to now include the step of determining which halftone screen is to be used in rendering the text with the selected halftone screen based on the outcome of the comparison. This aspect is disclosed throughout the specification of the present invention.

Claim 1 has also been amended to correct several inconsistencies in the claim language. The claim has been amended to include receiving a user-specified font sharpening threshold. The term "user defined font sharpening threshold" has been changed to "user-specified font sharpening threshold" to use consistent claim language. These amendments are for reasons of clarity and should not affect the scope of the claim.

Claims 1, 3, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 7,085,000 (hereinafter Coleman). Coleman discloses a printing system for printing objects of different object types. The system includes a printer controlled device with a user interface for associating printer-independent print quality characteristics with a selected object type to be printed. These characteristics include instruction associated with an element that indicates features that may be emphasized when printing the element. The characteristics may include sharpening edges, reducing model, and distinguishing tone and edges among others.

Claim 1 has been amended to now include, *inter alia*, determining the user-specified font sharpening threshold is a predetermined value and preventing said text from being rendered with a high frequency halftone screen. When the user-specified font sharpening threshold is not a predetermined value, the previously established font sharpening threshold will be overridden and the appropriate halftone screen is then determined. Coleman does not disclose the ability

for the system to override the comparison of which halftone screen to use when the user enters a predetermined value. For at least this reason, independent claim 1 and dependent claim 3 are not made obvious by Coleman.

Claim 5 has been amended to now include that the raster image processor is programmed to render the text with low frequency halftone screens without performing the comparison upon receipt of a predetermined user-specified font sharpening threshold. Again, Coleman does not disclose the ability for the system to override the comparison process for the value that is entered by the user. For at least this reason, independent claim 5 and dependent claim 6 are not made obvious by Coleman.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman in view of US Patent No. 6,452,132. Claim 7 depends from independent claim 5 and is not made obvious for at least the same reasons stated above for independent claim 5.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant submits the present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COATS & BENNETT, P.L.L.C.



David D. Kalish

Registration No.: 42,706

Dated: August 5, 2008

1400 Crescent Green, Suite 300
Cary, NC 27518
Telephone: (919) 854-1844
Facsimile: (919) 854-2084